

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/043,587	01/10/2002	Steven Zettel	0499-036	6331	
7590 12/27/2005			EXAMINER		
Bradley N. Ruben			TRAN, HIEN THI		
463 First Street	:				
Suite 5A			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Hoboken, NJ 07030-1859			1764		

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/043,587	ZETTEL, STEVEN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Hien Tran	1764	

Before the Filling of all Appear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Hien Tran	1764			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 19 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	Appeal. To avoid abaidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of se appeal. Since		
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beappeal; and/or 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-6,8-16,18 and 21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .		ll be entered and an e	explanation of		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	It before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but of the same reasons set forth in the final office action.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
13. ☐ Other: see attached sheets.		then Tran			
		Hien Tran Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1764			

Application/Control Number: 10/043,587

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/19/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that page 8, lines 12-17 discloses that the air blockage points 32 (Fig. 4) which acts as dams, or raised portion and therefore the structures with corrugations are improperly considered by the examiner to be "dams" as claimed. However, it is not clear from Fig. 4 that any dams are provided. Since it is unclear from the drawings as set forth above, any corrugation structures with peaks and valleys can be considered as dams or raised portions.

Applicant argues that Yamada only shows a mesh, not whether such is woven or knitted. Such contention is not persuasive as the secondary reference, Harding, is relied upon for teaching the method of forming the wire mesh, e.g. knitting and crimping method.

Applicant argues that Harding only shows a knitted wire mesh rope buried in the knitted mesh sheet at the end of the converter, which acts as a seal, not to stop the gas flow by altering the configuration of the knitted mesh. Such contention is not persuasive as set forth above, the secondary reference, Harding, is relied upon for teaching that the wire mesh layer may be formed by knitting method and have crimped corrugations.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself.

Applicant argues that Machida teaches away from using a wire mesh. Such contention is not persuasive as Machida is only relied upon for teaching the conventionality of using non-intumescent material as an insulation material.

Art Unit: 1764

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hien Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-1454. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HT

Hien Tran Primary Examiner Art Unit 1764

Hren Tran